

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Acknowledgement of Claim to Priority

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the claim to priority of this application to French Application 99/11021 filed on September 2, 1999.

Formal Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner acknowledge the drawings filed with this application as formal.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicates a lack of antecedent basis for the phrase “the parking authorization control elements.” Claim 1 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions. Further, claims 5-6, and 8 are rejected because the scope of the phrase “identification information” is unclear. Claims 5-6 and 8 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 4. Thus, claims 4-6 have been amended to clarify the present invention recited. Specifically, the phrase “identification information” in amended claims 5-6 and claim 8 (unamended) refers to the same previously recited phrase in amended claim 4.

With respect to claim 16, the Examiner asserts that the phrase “a prepaid scratchable ticket” is unclear. This particular phrase in claim 16 has been amended to recite “a prepaid scratchable card.” Applicant submits that page 6, lines 8-18 of the specification clearly defines the scope of “a prepaid scratchable card.” Specifically, a prepaid scratchable card is defined as a

card that is bought to recharge an account, where a user buys the prepaid scratchable card, calls the server, and inputs the number inscribed on the prepaid scratchable card so that the user's account is recharged.

Although not specifically rejected by the Examiner, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 10 to clarify the present invention as recited. Based on the amendments made above, claims 2-4, 7, 9-15, and 17 also overcome the have 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection as to claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO97/37328 ("Ouimet") in view of WO98/04080 ("Zeitman").

The present invention relates to using a mobile telephone to provide parking information to a parking server. Specifically, the present invention provides a two-step communication involving a ticket machine. The ticket machine is connected to the parking server, and the user using the mobile telephone provides the parking server parking information (such as parking time, etc.). The parking server transmits the parking information to the ticket machine, and the ticket machine subsequently supplies parking authorization control elements with the parking information. Parking authorization control elements may include tickets printed by the ticket machine, a list derived by the ticket machine, a portable control device receiving information from the ticket machine, etc. (see, *e.g.*, page 3 of the specification).

By allowing the user to call into the parking server once and provide parking information, and then allowing the parking server to transmit this information to the ticket machine, the ticket machine is capable of producing parking authorization control elements that include the information provided by the user and may be used to calculate the parking fees. The parking fee is then deducted using an account that is associated with the user's mobile phone. Thus, the user makes one call and all the parking information and parking fees are calculated without the user having to do anything else. Further, the present invention is compatible with existing traditional parking systems that require a user to pay for parking using a payment terminal, for example. The payment terminal can be used to communicate with the parking server in the same manner as the ticket machine (see, *e.g.*, page 4 of the specification).

In contrast to the present invention, Ouimet discloses a wireless network which transmits parking data to portable terminals (*i.e.*, mobile terminals) for use by parking wardens inspecting parking spaces. Ouimet discloses that users use a payment terminal to input parking information such as parking time and parking payments. The payment terminals then wirelessly transmit the parking information to the parking control central computer. Thus, the present invention significantly differs from Ouimet in that Ouimet requires the use of payment terminals to input parking information, whereas the present invention uses a user's mobile phone to transmit parking information.

With respect to Ouimet, the Examiner admits that Ouimet fails to disclose or suggest the use of a mobile telephone to provide parking information to a parking server. Further, the Examiner states that Zeitman discloses the use of a mobile telephone so that a user may provide parking information. Therefore, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Ouimet and Zeitman to achieve the present invention.

Application respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reasoning. Neither Ouimet nor Zeitman disclose the use of a ticket machine as defined in the present invention. The ticket machine, as claimed in claim 1, is a machine that produces parking authorization control elements, such as a printed ticket with the user's parking information. Although Ouimet discloses a mobile terminal that produces citations or parking tickets (*i.e.*, the type of ticket to issue to a user for violation of parking time), the mobile terminal of Ouimet does not produce any type of parking authorization control elements with the parking information input by a user. Ouimet discloses traditional payment terminals that produce payment tickets for use to calculate parking fees. However, the payment terminal cannot be the ticket machine of the present invention because the payment terminal only produces payment tickets (*i.e.*, a receipt for the user to pay parking fees. Meanwhile, the present invention discloses that parking fees are calculated without any payment tickets and the user is billed directly to an account associated with the user's mobile phone. Thus, Ouimet does not disclose or suggest a ticket machine as defined in the present invention.

Further, Zeitman does not disclose or suggest using a ticket machine as recited in the present invention. Zeitman discloses that a user using a mobile phone provides a central interface unit with parking information (see, *e.g.*, page 6 of Zeitman). Subsequently, the central

interface unit reports which parking facilities are being used to a law enforcement unit, typically held by a law enforcement officer (see Zeitman, Figure 2). Accordingly, Zeitman fails to disclose or suggest sending information concerning parking time from a parking server to a ticket machine.

Moreover, neither Ouimet nor Zeitman, whether considered separately or in combination, discloses parking authorization control elements, as defined in claim 1 of the present invention. As described above, Ouimet discloses parking tickets as parking citations issued by the mobile terminal used by parking wardens. Similarly, Zeitman also discloses the use of a law enforcement unit used by parking wardens to issue parking citations. However, the authorization control elements of the present invention are *not* used for payment purposes or for citations. Rather, authorization control elements are used to indicate parking information input by a user using a mobile phone. Thus, neither Ouimet nor Zeitman disclose or suggest that any type of ticket or list printed by a ticket machine includes the parking information originally input by the user.

Additionally, Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine references Ouimet and Zeitman because Zeitman teaches away from using ticket machines or payment terminals. Zeitman states that parking meters (*i.e.*, ticket machines, payment terminals, etc.) are expensive and require comprehensive monitoring by enforcement personnel (see Zeitman, Background). Thus, Zeitman teaches away from using any type of parking meters, and Ouimet explicitly requires the use of payment terminals. Thus, one skilled in the art would not combine Ouimet and Zeitman to achieve the present invention.


Thus, Ouimet and Zeitman, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Thus, Ouimet and Zeitman do not render the present invention obvious. Dependent claims 2-17 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09667/002001; 73.0478US).

Dated: October 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
for Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
Osha & May L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

76368_1.DOC